

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE FOR
THREE TAXA BELONGING TO THE CLASS GRAPTOLITHINA
LECTOTYPES WHICH WILL SECURE THE CONTINUED USE OF
THE NAMES CONCERNED IN THEIR ACCUSTOMED SENSE

By O. M. B. BULMAN, Sc.D., F.R.S.

(Cambridge University, Department of Geology, Cambridge)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 1248)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to stabilise the usage of three names in the Class Graptolithina by designating for the taxa concerned lectotypes in harmony with the current interpretation of those taxa. In each case the need for the action now recommended has arisen through the injudicious selection as the lectotype of a syntype which does not agree either with the original description or with the current interpretation of the unit in question. The problem described above has come to light in the course of a revision of the Triangulate Monograptids from the *gregarius* zone (Lower Llandovery) undertaken by Mrs. Margaret Sudbury (*née* Walker) in this Department. Arrangements are being made for the early publication of Mrs. Sudbury's revision and it would greatly increase the value of that work and promote stability in the nomenclature of the group concerned if it were possible for the International Commission to take decisions on the questions now submitted before that paper is published. Particulars of the three cases concerned are given in the following paragraphs.

Case No. 1

3. The name with which we are here primarily concerned is *Monograptus fimbriatus* var. *similis* Elles (G.L.) & Wood (E.M.R.), 1913 (*Mon. Brit. Grapt.*, Palaeont. Soc. (9) : 483, pl. xlviii, figs. 5a—d, text-fig. 339). In 1941 (*Rozpr. české Akad.* 52 (No. 30) : 8) Přibyl (A.) & Münch (A.) selected as the lectotype of this taxon the specimen figured by Elles & Wood as fig. 5a. Those authors' material is now in the Sedgwick Museum and Birmingham University and an examination of the specimen figured by them under the above number shows that the figure in question is inaccurate and misleading, since the proximal end of this specimen does not in fact show the sicula, and it can only be identified as *similis* with reserve.

3. As a result of the foregoing lectotype selection, the name *similis* Elles & Wood can no longer be applied with certainty to the species customarily so known and becomes virtually a *nomen dubium*. In the interest of stability in nomenclature the International Commission is asked to use its Plenary Powers to set aside the lectotype selection described above and in its place to designate as the lectotype of *similis* the specimen illustrated by Elles & Wood as text-fig. 339 (original in the Sedgwick Museum, registered under the Museum Number A21479), the interpretation of which is not open to any doubt.

Case No. 2

4. The second of the taxa to be considered was described as a variety of *Rastrites triangulatus* Harkness (R.), 1851 (*Quart. J. geol. Soc. Lond.* 7 : 59, pl. 1, figs. 3a—d) under the name *Monograptus triangulatus* var. *major* Elles & Wood, 1913 (*Mon. Brit. Grapt.*, Palaeont. Soc. (9) : 472, pl. xlvii, figs. 5a—d, text-figs. 328a, b). From among the specimens figured by Elles & Wood, Přibyl & Münch (1941, *loc. cit.* : 6) selected as the lectotype of this taxon that illustrated as figure 5a.

5. A re-examination of the original material in the collection of the Geological Survey and Museum, London, the Sedgwick Museum and the British Museum (Natural History), has shown that the foregoing was a most unfortunate lectotype selection, for the specimen shown as fig. 5a is not referable to *major* at all, being a true *triangulatus* Harkness. Accordingly, as matters now stand, the name *major* Elles & Wood falls as a junior subjective synonym of *triangulatus* Harkness, and the taxon hitherto known as *major* Elles & Wood is left without a name. In order to prevent the disturbance in current practice which would result from the foregoing changes, the International Commission is asked to use its Plenary Powers to set aside the lectotype selection discussed above and to designate as the lectotype of the foregoing taxon the specimen illustrated by Elles & Wood as text-fig. 328b, which is now preserved in the Geological Survey Museum under the Registered Number 26326.

Case No. 3

6. The third of the taxa involved in the present application was described as a variety of *Monograptus convolutus* var. *communis* Lapworth (C.), 1876 (*Geol. Mag.* 13 : 358, pl. xiii, figs. 4a, 4b) under the name *Monograptus communis* var. *rostratus* by Elles & Wood, 1913 (*Mon. Brit. Grapt.*, Palaeont. Soc. (9) : 481, pl. xlix, figs. 2a—c, text-fig. 337). In 1945 (*Bull. int. Acad. tscheq. Sci.* 54 (No. 19) : 31) Přibyl specified the specimen shown by Elles & Wood as figure 2a as the "holotype" [sic] of *rostratus*. This specimen was apparently so described by Přibyl because Elles & Wood stated that the above figure

represented a "typical specimen" of *rostratus*, but this cannot be interpreted as a designation of the above specimen as the holotype, for in the same work Elles & Wood stated also that the specimen shown in their figure 2b was a "well-preserved and typical specimen". While therefore Příbyl was in error in regarding the specimen shown in figure 2a as the holotype of *rostratus*, the statement in his paper must be regarded as constituting a valid selection of that specimen to be the lectotype of this taxon.

7. A re-examination of the specimen illustrated by Elles & Wood as fig. 2a, which is now preserved in the collection of Geological Department of Birmingham University, shows that it does not belong to the same species as that described by Elles & Wood and illustrated in their other figures, being referable to a new species at present without a name (apart from *rostratus*). It would be highly confusing if this new species had to be known by the name *rostratus* Elles & Wood and if a new name had to be provided for the species described by those authors as *rostratus* and now universally known by that name. The International Commission is therefore asked to use its Plenary Powers to set aside the lectotype selection for *rostratus* Elles & Wood made by Příbyl in 1945 and in its place to designate the specimen figured by those authors as fig. 2b (also shown as text-fig. 337) to be the lectotype of this taxon. The specimen so recommended is in the collection of the Geological Survey of Scotland, where it is preserved under the Registered Number 2630.

Recommendations

8. The three names as now proposed to be interpreted under the Plenary Powers should all be placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*. So also should the names of the taxa (*fimbriatus* Nicholson; *triangulatus* Harkness; *communis* Lapworth) which enter into this case by reason of the fact that the taxa now proposed to be interpreted were published as varieties of the taxa so named. It is therefore now recommended that the names *triangulatus* Harkness and *communis* Lapworth should be placed on the above *Official List*. A corresponding recommendation is not, however, now made in regard to the name *fimbriatus*, for, although this name represents a taxonomically valid unit and certainly should be placed on the *Official List*, there are certain nomenclatorial problems associated with this name which require first to be considered. A separate application in regard to this name is in preparation for submission to the International Commission.

9. In the light of the considerations advanced above, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked :—

- (1) to use its Plenary Powers to set aside all lectotype selections hitherto made for the nominal taxa specified in Col. (1) below and, having

done so, to designate as their respective lectotypes the specimens severally specified in Col. (2) :—

*Nominal taxon for which it
is proposed that a
lectotype be designated
under the Plenary Powers*

*Specimen proposed to be
designated under the Plenary
Powers to be the lectotype
of the nominal taxon
specified in Col. (1)*

(1)

(2)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(a) <i>Monograptus fimbriatus</i> var.
<i>similis</i> Elles (G.L.) & Wood
(E.M.R.), 1913</p> | <p>The specimen illustrated by
Elles & Wood as text-fig.
339 now preserved in the
Sedgwick Museum (Regd.
No. A21479)</p> |
| <p>(b) <i>Monograptus triangulatus</i> var.
<i>major</i> Elles & Wood, 1913</p> | <p>The specimen illustrated by
Elles & Wood as text-fig.
328b now preserved in the
collection of the Geological
Survey and Museum, London
(Regd. No. 26326)</p> |
| <p>(c) <i>Monograptus communis</i> var.
<i>rostratus</i> Elles & Wood, 1913</p> | <p>The specimen illustrated by
Elles & Wood as fig. 2b on
pl. xlix (which is also the
specimen shown on text-fig.
337) now preserved in the
collection of the Geological
Survey of Scotland (Regd.
No. 2360)</p> |

(2) to place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—

- (a) *similis* Elles (G.L.) & Wood (E.M.R.), 1913, as published in the combination *Monograptus fimbriatus* var. *similis* and as interpreted by the lectotype designated under the Plenary Powers in (1)(a) above ;
- (b) *triangulatus* Harkness (R.), 1851, as published in the combination *Rastrites triangulatus* ;
- (c) *major* Elles (G.L.) & Wood (E.M.R.), 1913, as published in the combination *Monograptus triangulatus* var. *major* and as interpreted by the lectotype designated under the Plenary Powers in (1)(b) above ;

- (d) *communis* Lapworth (C.), 1876, as published in the combination *Monograptus convolutus* var. *communis* ;
- (e) *rostratus* Elles (G.L.) & Wood (E.M.R.), 1913, as published in the combination *Monograptus communis* var. *rostratus* and as interpreted by the lectotype designated under the Plenary Powers in (1)(c) above.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION "
AUTHORISING THE USE OF THE SYMBOL FOR THE DIAERESIS

By **CHARLES H. BLAKE**

(Hillsboro, North Carolina, U.S.A.)

(Commission Reference: Z.N. (S.) 1013)

(For the proposal in this case see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **13** : 292-293)

(Letter dated 12th October 1957)

In connection with the proposal to make a declaration relative to the use of the diaeresis, I present the following considerations. So far as the ordinary languages of Western Europe are concerned, the diaeresis has only one function, namely, to indicate that two successive vowels are pronounced separately rather than as a diphthong. Since scientific names are, by definition, either of Latin origin or Latinized words of other languages, it would seem that the diaeresis can only be used in places where the Romans themselves would have used it. For example, it is necessary in *aëdon*. On the other hand it is not necessary in *Picoides*. This is in spite of the fact that the diaeresis was originally published on the second *i* because it was used to show that the diphthong was pronounced as in Greek and not as in French. I cannot at the moment call to mind any case in which the same spelling with and without a diaeresis has different meanings but would not be surprised if such cases occur.

I favor, then, the retention of the diaeresis in its proper places with the proviso that it not be confused with other diacritical marks.